G R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1907.

(Muzrai)

File No. 175- 1907

Serial Nos. 1-12

Papers Filed.

Month October 1908.

SUBJECT.

Suit filed in the Sub-judge's Court at Tinnevelly against the Swamigale of the Sri Vijayarayaswami Matt by one Seshapattar Iyer

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
	Muzr F 541-08 Sls 1-4

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

OFFICE NOTE.

File No. 7/3/

SUBJECT.

Suit filed in the Sub-Judge's court at Tinnevelly against the Swamy of the Sri Vysaraya Matt by one Senapathi Iyer

From

The Swamigalu.

Regd No. 2553 Dated 20th Nov 1906.

It was brought to the notice of Govt. that by the Govt agent of the Sri Vysaraya Matt that a suit was filed by Senapathi Iyer in the Sub-court at Tinnevelly of against the late Swamigalu & Venkataramana-chas for the recovery of Rs 3000/- The Govt agent was informed that the suit should be contested on the ground that the amount alleged to have been paid by the

to the matt through the Second Defendant was not for bona-fide purposes of the matt & that the Swamy has been asked to furnish details of the transaction. The first agent thereupon reported that he appointed Mr K. Rama Row, B.A B.L. Pleader at Tinnevelly to conduct the defence & that the necessary Vakalat has been filed & adjournment applied for & requested that the papers might be obtained from the Swami & sent to him.

The first agent again reports now (1) that the Pleader's fees payable to the Lawyer under the Rules would be Rs 150/- calculated at 5 per cent & that half this sum will have to be paid to him on the date the Defendants' written Statement is filed in the Court. 2) that a separate power-of-attorney from the new Sivaramigalu may be necessary & (3) that a further adjournment

Muzrai Secretariat. File No 175 of 1907

may have to be asked for

The Swami (present)
in his Srimukham ~~made disposal~~
states that the transaction in
question between the Matt &
Senapathi Iyer is not borne out
by any correspondence in the
Matt records or account books -
that the Matt servants too say
that no body is aware of such
a transaction having taken place.
He however states that ~~it is stated~~
on enquiry he learns from the
Matt that sometime back a
sum of Rs 1000/- was received from
Venkatarayanachi by Postal Money
Order, that the late Swamy sent
a Sirup to Venkatarayanachi.
that as the said Venkatarayanachi
did not act up to the terms of the
Sirup, the said sum of Rs 1000

No
of

MGCPB—3,500—15-10-01

was returned to him
with interest & remittance
Charges & ~~that the amount~~
~~was banked~~ by Sankara Iyer,
on behalf of the Swamy.
at his desire.

JA
26/11/06

The Govt agent in his Letter
No 36 dy 20th November 1906 ~~reports~~
~~that~~ forwards copies of correspondence
between him & the Dr Ramarow
Pleader engaged for the case &
states that a fresh Power-of-
attorney is necessary & that
the old one executed by the late
Swami has become inoperative,
& that therefore the Suit will have to
be adjourned for bringing in the
new Swamigalu.

Submitted
JA
27/11/06

This and other matters
require the Govt Agents
presence here. He may
come back here at once.

Rs
22/11/06

MG,CPB—3,500—15-10-04.

JA 23/11/06

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. 175 of 1907

(note Continued)

The Suit that was filed by Senapathi Iyer in the Sub-Court at Tinnevelly against the Vyasarayaswami Mattu and Venkatarayanachar for the recovery of a Sum of Rs 2950/-

Rs 1000-	Advance paid to Defendants	
" 270-	Interest for the above Sum for 3 years from 21/9/03 to 20/9/06 at 9% -	
" 1680	Compensation for the loss sustained by the Plaintiff in consequence of the non-performance of the agreement by the Defendants.	
Rs 2950.		

was decided disallowing the claim of the Plaintiff to the extent of Rs 1790 and ordering that a Sum of Rs 1160 and proportionate costs of the Suit with [illegible]

MGCPB—3,500—15-10-04

6

thereon at 6% interest upto date of payment be paid from the Inatt funds to the Plaintiff. It was also decreed that the Plaintiff should pay the Inatt his costs on the sum disallowed -

For defending the Suit ~~in the~~ on behalf of the Inatt in the original court Mr R. Ramachow B.a B.L, Pleader at Tinnevelly. Bridge was engaged by the Govt Agent with the approval of Govt A Sum of Rs 147-8-0 was fixed as the Pleaders' fee at the Regulation rate of 5 per cent on the amount of the suit - A Sum of Rs 47-8-0 has already been paid to him & the balance viz Rs 100/- is still due to him -

vide the office No 4461 dt 13-3-07 -

The Govt Agent while -

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. 175 of 1907

Report no 12 dy 15/8/08.

Submitting a Copy of the Judgment in the Case has forwarded a memorandum of Appeal drawn by Mr Ramachar, Pleader. He states that if an appeal is preferred the cost will be about Rs 85 besides Vakil's fees if he hereafter fixed, & that it would be of great help if the opinion of the Govt Advocate is obtained on the probability of Success. The limit of time to file the Appeal expiries by the 5th September 1908.

The Govt Agent states that he has some doubt in the matter Success in the Appeal Court. as it is difficult to Convince the Dt Judge that the late Swamigalu had no knowledge ~~of the~~ that the Sum of Rs 1000/- sent to

8

File No. 175 of 1907 | Muzrai Secretariat

2nd Defendant Venkataramanacha was not Plaintiff's money - The Govt Agent states that incase the Plaintiff himself files an Appeal for the recovery of the his claim of Rs 1790 disallowed by the Sub-Judge, the matt might then prefer a cross appeal on the lines indicated by Pleader in Ramatrow in his draft appeal memo:

Gl No 715 Dated 17th August 1908 Encl 1 & 2

15/8/08

Forwarded to the Govt Advocate for a kind expression of opinion as to whether an appeal maybe usefully pled

C.S. Balasundaram Jr

1:8:1908

I am of opinion that the judge has correctly arrived at the conclusion that the

No: 55. dated 18-8-08

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. 175 of 1907

Lake Swamy was not justified in retaining the amount of Rs 1000/- to 2nd deft as alleged by him and that the alleged non-payment to 2nd deft is doubtful. It is therefore inadvisable to file an appeal.

It may be noted that no plea seems to have been advanced on behalf of the 3rd deft. when he was made a party to the suit, to the effect that there was no legal necessity for the Lake Swamy to raise money by entering into an agreement to lease the village two years before the expiry of the existing lease, & that transacting the interests of the trust, that the transaction was not binding on his successor the 3rd defendant.

10

File No. 175 of 1907 | Muzrai Secretariat

that the Mutt property on the bounds of the 3rd defdt is not liable to plaintiffs claim.

S Narayanadas Govt Advocate.
18 8 08

What has the Govt agents Govt opinion?

In the circumstances of the case it does not seem desirable to prefer an appeal and incur more expenditure. The Govt advocate also thinks that the judgment is correct + that it is not advisable to file an appeal. ~~Stop~~ The agent may be told that no appeal need be filed + steps maybe taken to pay the decretal amount into Court at an early date

2nd Cr

187

I agree
BRA
19/8/08

I P
Issue direction for payment
19/8/08

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. 175 of 1907

(note Continued)

The Govt agent was asked to report on the omission pointed out by the Govt. Advocate. In reply he states that the plea indicated by the Govt. Advocate is purely a question of law and did not depend upon any facts that should have been supplied by him (the govt agent) to the Pleader. He forwards the explanation furnished by the Hon R Ramanow Ba. B.L, Pleader who defended the case on behalf of the 3rd Defendant (the matt)

x no 16 dy 31/8/08

Submitted 7/9/08. Submd to 2nd C. for perusal

no doubt he is a clever Lawyer

7/9/08

7/9/08

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat



G P B—3,000—25-9-07

Muzrai Secretariat	File No. 175 of 1907

Sl 11. To. Mr. R. RamaRao, Pleader,
Tinnevelly
No 1295 D/22 9.08
Deo Intimates that the Sum of
Rs 100/- has been remitted to Tinnevelly
insured post.

Sl 12. From. Mr. R. RamaRao, Pleader.
No 132 D/5.10.08.
Acknowledges the receipt of the
above

File No. of 190 .

Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Mysore Government
for Sri. Vyasaraya Swami. Matt,
in the Mugrai depart
Dated, Camp Limmanelly Bridge,
the 14th March 1907.

8/3/07

Mugr F 175-07-1

No. 55

To

The Secretary to the Government
of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore
in the Mugrai depart
Bangalore

Report submitted by M. Raghavendra Rao, the Mysore Government Agent for Sri Vyasaraya Swami Matt.

Re Lawyer's fees in O.S. No. 34/06 on the file of the Limmanelly Sub-Judge's Court.

For conducting the defence on behalf of the Matt Sri R. Rama Rao BA, BL 1st grade Pleader, at Limmanelly Bridge, charges the regulation fee of Rs 5 per cent on suit value of the case viz Rs 2950, which amounts to Rs 147.8.0. Should the case be terminated favorably to the Matt there will possibly be an award for this sum in favor of the Matt under Court Costs to be paid by the Plaintiff. The Government Agent most respectfully solicits that sanction may be accorded for the charge of Rs 147.8.0. Of which a sum of Rs 47.8.0. may be paid to the Pleader now) Rs 50 on the trial day (6th August 1907) and the

Pay Rs. 47-8-0
as per
recommended

7/4/07

Remitted for
20th April
1907

an amount sum of Rs. 5.0 on the closing of

M. Raghavendra Rao

Mysore Government Agent

for Sri Vyasaraya Swami Matt.

MYSORE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

Office of the Mysore Government Agent
for Sri Vasista Linga Mills

No. 62 Dated Cauvery Camp 9th June 1910

To

THE SECRETARY

Mysore

Reference to M. Report No. M. Dated 1910

Reference —

Subject.— Original not to be on the file: Sale proceeds of Zamindelly Estate Agent to be remitted to Mysore and other.

I respectfully beg to submit for favour of information copies of Telegrams dated 7th and 8th June 1910 received from Mr. Turner for B. & B. Z. Limited Zamindelly Bridge stating that the examination of the Power Supply Mains on the 7th instant and that of the Engines Mains on the 8th instant

The Limited Company not to be responsible for Electric Supply Mains and Engines in the Power House the result to give evidence on behalf of the Company I am respectfully to report that I am happy to

matadhipathi to send Kharbharam
char forthwith so that he may reach Tumane
Bridge on the 23rd instant at the latest.

3 As there is hardly any time to remit the
amount to the Matt for payment to Subbanna
Somachar, he may be directed to proceed to
Pelly Bridge obtaining some advance from the
which will be refunded by me later on.

I beg to remain,

Sir;

Your most obedient Servant

K. Raghavendra Rao,

Mysore Government Agent

for Sri Vijayarayaswami Matt

Irwin Bridge 18/4

Mysore City
18 June 1908
H. J. O.

Reg no 61

To M. Raghavendra Rao
Vasaraya Mutt Q.rs
Agent Mysore City

Two witnesses examined today, case posted
twenty second June, for defence twenty fourth
Send or bring Rattangapuram Subbacharar,
Narayanarao

"True Copy"
M. Raghavendra Rao
19/6/08
Mysore Agent
Sri Vyasaraya Swami Mutt

ಅನುವಾದ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ (8)

Immanelly Bridge 17 [illegible]

Mysore City 17 June 1908 G.T.O

Reg. no 60

To

M. Raghavendra Rao
Vyasaraya Mutt Agent
Mysore city

Thirty four plaintiff examined today, defence hopeful continues tomorrow

= Narayanan =

True copy
M. Raghavendra Rao
1916/08
Mysore Goat agent
Sri Vyasaraya Swami

No C. 1-608. 175-07-3

5774
22-6-1908

submit a report

Muzf 175-07-4

MYSORE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

Office of the Mysore Government Agent
for Sri Vyasarayaswami Matt.

No. 63 Dated Camp Tumakuru 18th July 1907.



To

THE SECRETARY
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE
IN THE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT
BAGNALORE.

Report submitted by M: Raghavendra Rao, the Mysore Government Agent for Sri Vyasarayaswami Matt.

Reference :— My report no 55 dated 16th March 1907

Subject :— Suit no 34/06 by Senapathi Iyer against the Matt and Venkataramanachar in the Sub Judges court Tumakuru for Rs 2950.

Sir,

I beg respectfully to report that the substance of the Decree in the above case was announced to the effect that the Matt and Venkataramanachar the son of late Venkataramanachar, should pay Plaintiff Rs 1000 with interest and costs for the decreed amount. The remaining claim of the Plaintiff for Rs 1950 has been rejected.

2. On hearing the judgment I shall submit a report as to the liability or

otherwise of preferring an appeal Tinnavelly District Court against the decree of the Original Court as affecting the matter for Rs 1000. The Plaintiff told me that he would put in an appeal for the recovery of Rs 1950 dismissed by the Sub Court Tinnavelly

Vakeel Mr R Rama Rao B A B L says that the decree is wrong as the Plaintiff has not established his claim even for Rs 1000 against the Natt.

4 The fee of Rs 100 payable to Vakeel Mr R Rama Rao ~~has~~ Kindly be remitted direct to that gentleman at Tinnavelly Bridge and the intimation of the same may be sent to me.

5 I have asked Mr Rama Rao to obtain public copies of Judgment and Decree and while sending the same to me, I have requested him, to favor me with a list of whatever ground he considers there are in the case in favor of the Natt for filing an appeal.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
your most obedient Servant

Sd/- [illegible]

Officiating Government Agent
for Sir Vyasarayaswami Nait

175-07-5

MYSORE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.



Dept
Law

submit To
attorney Gen

W 10/7/08

OFFICE OF THE MYSORE GOVERNMENT AGENT
FOR SRI VYASARAYASWAMI MATT.

DATED Camp to Nanjangud 8th July 1908.

THE SECRETARY
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE
IN THE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT
BAGNALORE.

Report submitted by M. Raghavendra Rao, the Mysore Government Agent for Sri Vyasarayaswami Matt.

Reference :—

Subject :—

In continuation of my report no 63 dated 1st July 1908 I respectfully beg to add that the Tirumangalam sub judge's judgment in O S no 36/06 was pronounced yesterday by Vakil Mr P Rama Rao Ht Sa; that the sub judge has erred in the assumption of facts in and also in the application of law to the case and that there is a good case for the main appeal against the findings therein contained

2 He also told me that the sub judge has awarded costs to the tune of Rs 1950 disallowing

by him and in
for Rs 1000 he has allowed to him interest
at 6 p.c per annum from the date in January
1904 on which the Plaintiff sent a Telegram
to the Mail intimating that he would send
money for the lease except Rs 1000 already sent.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
your most obedient servant

M. Raghavendra Rao

Mysore Government Agent
for Sir Vyasarayaswamy Mutt

Muzf 10/5-07-6

MYSORE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE OF THE MYSORE GOVERNMENT AGENT
FOR SRI VYASARAYASWAMI MATT.

No. 10 DATED, Camp Bhavan, 1st July 1908.

568
4/8/08.

To

THE SECRETARY
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE
IN THE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT
BAGNALORE.

Report submitted by M. Raghavendra Rao, the Mysore Government Agent for Sri Vyasarayaswami Matt.

Reference :—

Subject :—

Sir,

In continuation of my report No 63 dated 1st July 1908, I respectfully beg to state that Mr. K Rama Rao B A, B L Vakeel at Limasolly has sent a remittance i e for the payment of his fee of Rs 100 sent to Mr. Sharma, conducting the defence on behalf of the Sri Vyasa-raya swami Matt, in O.S No. 3½ of 06 Court at Limasolly. I request that you will be so good as to cause the amount to be sent to him

Sir
Your most obedient
Servant
M. Raghavendra Rao
Mysore Government Agent
Sri Vyasarayaswami Matt

MYSORE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

Munzf-175-07-7

OFFICE OF THE MYSORE GOVERNMENT AGENT
FOR SRI VYASARAYASWAMI MATT

No. 12 DATED, Bangalore 15th August 1908.



To

THE SECRETARY
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE
IN THE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT
BANGALORE

Report submitted by M. Raghavendra Rao, the Mysore Government Agent for Sri Vyasarayaswami Matt.

Reference :— Government Agent's Report No. 65 dated 8th July 1908.

Subject.— O S No 34/06 on the file of the Sub Court of Tinnevelly: Lenapathe Iyyer ~~of~~ Sri Vyasaraya Swami Matt and another.

Sir,

In continuation of my report quoted above, I respectfully beg to submit a copy of Judgment pronounced in the above case together with the grounds of appeal drafted by Mr. R. Rama Rao Pleader at Tinnevelly Brief. An extract from the Pleaders letter No 99 dated 7th August 1908 bearing on the subject is herewith submitted for favor of information

matter.

2. I request that on perusal of the above documents they may be returned to me with orders as to whether an appeal may be filed in the District Court of Tinnevelly against the decree of the Lower Court ordering payment to Plaintiff of Rs 1160 with interest and proportionate costs. Mr. Rama Rao says that the cost of Appeal will be about £85 besides Vakeels' fees to be hereafter fixed. It would be of great help if the opinion of the Government Advocate is obtained on the probability of success of the matter in the appeal Court.

3. I have myself some doubt in the matter of success in the Appeal Court as I fear that in the face of the Plaintiffs' Telegram to the Mata- dhipatte marked D/I it will be difficult to convince the District Judge that the 1st Defdt had no knowledge that the sum of £1000 sent to him by the 2nd Defdt by Telegraph money orders to be the amount drawn by 2nd Defdt from Plaintiff. Had 1st Defdt instituted enquiry on receipt of notices marked E and F from the Plaintiff as to whose money it was that 2nd Defdt sent to him, and had he, at the

told. Plaintiff that the amount was not his it would have helped the Matt now.

4 The limit of time to file the Appeal extends upto 4th September 1908. In case the filing of an Appeal is considered necessary it has to be filed in the District Court of Tumakuru by that date. Otherwise the sanction of Government may, it is requested, be obtained for payment to Court of the decreed amount of Rs 1160 with interest minus Matt costs ordered to be borne by the Plaintiff.

5 In case the Plaintiff himself files an appeal for the recovery of his claim of Rs 1790 as allowed by the Sub Judge of Tumakuru the Matt might prefer a cross appeal on the lines indicated by Pleader Mr. R Ramachar in his draft appeal memo.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
M. Raghavendra Rao
Mysore Government Agent
Sri Vyasaraya Swami Matt

forgery by Plaintiff

Extract of letter No 99 dated 7.8.08 from
Mr. R. Rama Rao B.A; B.L Pleader, Limavally
Bridge to Mysore Government Agent.

By today's post one copy of Judgment
in O.S. No 34/06. and draft appeal memo
have been sent to your address at Bangalore.

If you think there ought to be an
Appeal preferred against the Decree
please see that the copy of Judgment and
draft appeal and Vakalat are returned to
me at least within a fortnight or so.
My opinion is that the Lower Court has
been unduly influenced by the Telegram
to the Mutadhipathe and the fact that
there was no reply to the same and that it
is not at all a natural view in the light
of the explanation suggested or offered.
The authorities relied on and referred to
in the Judgment have very little to do with
the facts of the case and there are no
materials in the case to which those
authorities can be applied. Further
Ex: H is not contested as not being
genuine and the observation of the
Judge in regard to Ex H(a) cannot be
upheld because it is not stated to be
forgery by Plaintiff nor does such

The cost of Appeal will be about Rs 85
for filing and issuing summons. This
figure does not include Valuation.

"True extract"
M. Raghavendra Rao
Upper Government Agent
Anuradhapura Swamidas

2 Drafts

Murrai

Offl Memo

Govt Agents Report

no 12 dated 15 August

1908 forwarding for approval a Memo-

randum of appeal in

OS no 34/06 on the filing

the Sub-Judge at Jinnewally

against the decision of

Trial Court.

cpd

Murr f 175-07-8

No. 865 D/27.8.08

Ex. Es. 03

The Govt agent

is informed that Govt

do not consider it

advisable to file an

appeal.

2. A copy of the Govt

Advocates opinion in

the case is forwarded to

him. The Govt agent

is requested will explain the why

the plea indicated in

the Govt Advocates remarks
was not advanced on
behalf of the ~~2nd~~ 3rd
Defendant (the Draft).
3. ~~The Judg~~ The copy
of the Judgment & the
Memorandum of appeal
are returned herewith to him.
4- The balance of
Rs 100 due to Mr R. Ramarow
B.A. B.L. Pleader for
having conducted the
defence in this case
will be drawn and
remitted to him at an
early date.
5. The Govt Agent will
should Submit a bill
for the amount payable
to the Plaintiffs after obtaining
a copy of the Decree.

from the Court.

By order

H. C. Woods Dpty

Wm Secretary

Wm 11/18/08

2 Drgs.

Muz. 1 A]

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

Muz A 175-07-9

From

~~L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,~~

Secretary to the Government of

H H. the Maharaja of Mysore,

Muzrai Department.

To The Comptroller

Dated 27th august 1902

Despatched

Received

General No. 864

Muzrai F No.

Enclosure No 1 to 2

I am the honour to forward herewith a bill for Rs 150/- on account of the fees payable to Sri R Ramaiah Row Esq & Pleader Tumkur Bridge for holding Conduct of Reference — T. C.

Suit No 4 filed
06
Serafathiyar in the
Sub Judge's Court ab
Tirunelly against the
Ayaraayaswamy for
recovering a sum of Rs 2950
from the Instt.

2. Request that the
bill may be audited
and returned to this office
at an early date for
remittance to the Pleader
the charge being debited
to the Instt funds -

By order

for Secretary

W. 11/08

Muz 19]

MYSORE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

The Government of Mysore Dr

Particulars	Amount	Remarks
Amount of fees payable to Mr. R. Rama Rao, B.a B.L Pleader for having Conducted the defence in O.S No 34/06 on the file of the Sub Judge's court at Tinnevelly ~~against~~ filed by Senapathi Iyer against the Vyasarayaswami matt	100 ..	
Total Rs	100 ..	One hundred only

Bangalore
[illegible] 1907

GPB—100—2-10-07

873 Peter

MYSORE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

Urgent
Report
Please castume note
CK
Mz F 175-07-10

OFFICE OF THE MYSORE GOVERNMENT AGENT
FOR SRI VYASARAYASWAMI MATT.

No. 16

DATED Camp Mysore 31st August 1908.

To

THE SECRETARY
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE
IN THE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT
BAGNALORE.

MYSORE GOVT. 950 1/9/08

Report submitted by M. Raghavendra Rao, the Mysore Government Agent for Sri Vyasarayaswami Matt.

Reference :—

Subject :—

Sir,

With reference to Govt order no 865 dated 27th August, 1905 I respectfully beg to state that the plea indicated by the Govt Advocate is purely a question of law and does not depend upon any facts that should have been supplied by me to the Vakeel

2 Mr L. Rama Rao B.A B.L. Pleader who defended the case on behalf of the 3rd Deft (the matt) was called upon to explain the omission pointed out by the Govt Advocate and his explanation (letter

Submitted in original
3 for reconsideration and orders in the light of the Pleaders altered and the Copy of Judgment (61) are also
Copies of written Statement filed and
issues framed in O. S $\frac{34}{06}$ together with a
Kanarese translation of the Tamil Nirup
referred to by Mr. R. Rama Rao are also sub-
mitted for facility of reference.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

M Raghavendra Rao

Mysore Government Agent
for Sri Vyasarayaswami Mutt

Muz 1 A] Muzf-175-0

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

~~C. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,~~
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To H. R. Ramakrow Esqre
B.a.B.L
Pleader, Tinnevelly
Bandge

Dated 20th September

Despatched

Received

General No. 1071
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No

Has the honour to ~~remit herewith~~ state that a Sum of Rs 100/- payable ~~due~~ to him for having conducted the defence on behalf of the Sri Vya-Srirangaswami matt- in O.S No 34 on the file of the 2nd Sub Judge's court at Tinnevelly has been remitted to him by insured Post on the

GPB—2,000—7 2 06

17 Instant and to
that a Stamped
request the favour of
Receipt may be kindly forwarded
~~an acknowledgment~~.
to this Office -

By order
of
Secretary

No. 1296
Copy of the Post Master
General
1879/Cars

Mur F 175-07-12

Ltr. 9.10.08 Receipt file withdrawn

File with other Papers

From R. Ramachar.
Vakil, Juni Sudr Court

29/10/08 To

Chandrasekhara Iyer Esquire Bar-at-Law.
Secy. to the Govt: of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.
Genl: & Rev: Dept
Mysore Branch

As desired in your office letter no: 1295 of 22-9-1908 a stamped receipt for the sum of Rs 100. balance of fees in O.S. no: 34/06 on the file of the Subordinate Court. Juni Sudr is herewith sent.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Obedient Servant.

R. Ramachar.
5/10/08.

[illegible]